

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 5, 12 and 18 being the independent claims.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Allowed subject matter

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 1-11 and 18-22 with appreciation. Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's characterization of U.S. Patent No. 6,898,204B2 to Trachewsky *et al.* (hereinafter Trachewsky). For example, page 6 of the Office Action recites:

It is noted that the closes[t] prior art Trachewsky et al. (US Patent No. 6898204 B2) discloses comparing the SNR with a predetermined threshold.

However, Trachewsky teaches a subcircuit that "estimates the required gain to maximize signal-to-noise ratio, given the power estimate, and the binary indication from carrier sense" (see col. 61, lines 48-53 of Trachewsky).

Applicants also respectfully disagree with the statement on page 6 of the Office Action:

It is noted that the closes[t] prior art Trachewsky et al. (US Patent No. 6898204 B2) discloses that multiple copies of the signal are generated, they can be viewed as multiple intermediates of the same signal where multiple copies are used to estimate the signal power and the SNR from the preamble structure. Furthermore, based on these

measurements, the collision detection process is implemented to detect a collision.

However, Trachewsky only describes:

"A transmitted frame header includes a cyclic preamble wherein identical copies of a preamble symbol sequence are transmitted sequentially. A collision is declared if an estimate of error power in second and third copies of the preamble minus an estimate of error power in third and fourth copies of the preamble exceeds a first threshold, or a maximum value of the norm of each term of a source field error vector minus a greater of the estimate of the error power in the second and third copies of the cyclic preamble and the estimate of the error power in the third and fourth copies of the preamble exceeds a second threshold"

(see abstract of Trachewsky).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,898,204B2 to Trachewsky *et al.* (hereinafter Trachewsky). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Trachewsky is directed to "[a] method of determining a collision between two or more transmitting stations at one of the transmitting stations" (see abstract of Trachewsky). Trachewsky describes a subcircuit that "estimates the required gain to maximize signal-to-noise ratio, given the power estimate, and the binary indication from carrier sense" (see col. 61, lines 48-53 of Trachewsky).

Page 3 of the Office Action states:

The second sub circuit estimates the gain necessary to maximize the SNR and therefore a measurement of SNR is required if a proper gain is to be estimated.

Trachewsky does not describe a module and/or signals used to measure the SNR and therefore does not teach or suggest, among other features, "a signal to noise ratio (SNR) measurement module adapted to generate a SNR indication signal from the second intermediate signal and the data symbol sequence" as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, Trachewsky neither discloses nor suggests the combination of features recited in independent claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15 and 16

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trachewsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,657,326 to Burns *et al.* (hereinafter Burns). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 12 and are thus allowable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 12, and further in view of their own respective features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 16 is requested.

Claim 17

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trachewsky in view of European Patent Application 99600019.6 (publications number EP 1069554 A1) to Frantzeskakis (hereinafter

Frantzeskakis). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 17 depends from claim 12. As described above, Trachewsky does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 12. Frantzeskakis does not supply the teachings missing from Trachewsky with respect to claim 12. Thus, claim 17, is patentable over Trachewsky and Frantzeskakis for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 12, and further in view of its own features. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 17.

Objection to the Claims

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 13 and 14 as being dependent upon rejected base claims. Claims 13 and 14 depend from independent claim 12 and are thus patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12 and further in view of their own respective features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections of claims 13 and 14 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Patrick E. Garrett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,987

Date: October 6, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

433688_1.DOC